DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 421 CE 026 053

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE Funding for K-12 Career Education Efforts: Examples and Recommendations. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 31p.: For a related document see CE 025 932. The small print in the listing of participants may be marginally legible.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education: Conferences: *Educational Finance: Elementary Secondary Education: *Financial Needs: *Financial Support: Program Costs: *Resources

ABSTRACT

This monograph is one in a series designed to report discussions that took place during fifteen miniconferences for local K-12 career education coordinators. The topic of the miniconference reported in this monograph is funding for K-12 career education. After presenting an overview of career education funding sources, the miniconference proceedings are summarized under the following headings: How Much Does a Career Education Effort Cost? What Are K-12 School Districts Doing with Their Career Education Funds? and How to Make Funding for Career Education a Sustaining Priority in Education. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189421

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

FUNDING FOR K-12 CAREER EDUCATION EFFORTS: EXAMPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education

September 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 026 053

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shirley M. Hufstedler, *Secretary*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1980

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Preface

This monograph is one in a series designed to report, in narrative form, discussions that took place during a series of "miniconferences" for local K-12 Career Education Coordinators. A total of 15 such "miniconferences" were held between the period beginning in January and ending in July of 1979. This monograph, like all others in this series, is based on the notes I took while conducting each of these 15 "miniconferences." The OCE contractor responsible for logistical arrangements and for preparation of final notes (as corrected by the participants) was Inter-America Research Associates of Rosslyn, Virginia. That Contractor has compiled and published a limited quantity of the final notes. Copies of that report, while they last, may be obtained by writing to the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Participants for this series of miniconferences were selected by OCE based on nominations received from State Coordinators of Career Education. Each such Coordinator was asked to nominate, as possible participants, those K-12 Career Education Coordinators who, in the opinion of the State Coordinator, were doing the best job in implementing career education in their State. It is not, then, in any way a random sample of local K-12 career education coordinators whose experiences and opinions are reported here. Rather, these participants should be viewed as among the best in the opinion of their State Coordinators. Because it was impossible to select all persons nominated, there were many outstanding local Coordinators around the Nation who were not selected as participants.

An attempt was made to secure nominations from all 50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico and to pick a minimum of two local career education coordinators from each State as participants. The original plan was to select 10 participants—one each from 10 different States—as participants in each of the 15 miniconferences. Logistical problems prevented us from reaching this objective of having 150 participants. The final count of participants was 131 persons who, in combination, came from 45 different States and the District of Columbia. The actual number of participants in each miniconference ranged from a low of 7 to a high of 10 with a statistical average of 8.7 persons in attendance at each of the 15 miniconferences.

Each miniconference was conducted in the same basic way. We started by asking each participant to list the most practical and pressing issues, problems, and concerns she/he is facing in attempting to implement career education. A total of 407 such topics—an average of 27+ per miniconference—were raised by participants. Following this, participants were asked to vote on the 5-6 issues that they considered most crucial of all those raised at their miniconference. As time permitted, then, participants in each miniconference "brainstormed" the priority topics they had selected by their votes. Extensive discussions were held on 49 such priority topics, several

of which are discussed in this monograph. In addition, each participant was asked to present a short oral description of his/her attempts to implement career education in a given community and to share materials with other participants. Those reports and materials also form part of the content of each monograph in this series.

While no exact statistical data were gathered, it appears that participants in this series of miniconferences had, on the average, somewhere between five and six years of experience in attempting to implement career education. The basic purpose of each monograph in this series is to share this rich reservoir of experience with others interested in problems associated with the implementation of career education at the K-12 levels of Education.

The most striking observation one could make about participant comments was, as expected, the wide diversity of means they have found for overcoming the practical problems facing those charged with implementing career education. It should be obvious, to any thoughful reader, that there is no one best solution for any given problem. Rather, the best way to solve a particular problem will vary from community to community, from State to State, from school districts of various sizes, and from rural, suburban, and urban settings. It is, thus, a diversity of answers that the reader will hopefully find in the monographs of this series.

It will be equally obvious, to the experienced reader, that the practices of these experienced local career education coordinators varies greatly from much of the theoretical/philosophical literature of career education. It is very seldom that practitioners, faced with the multitude of practical constraints that exist at the local community level, can put into practice what those who, like myself, have the time to think, write, and speak about. I am impressed by how close many of them have come. I am even more impressed by some of the innovative, creative solutions some have found that go considerably beyond what the full-time career education conceptualizers have yet been able to think about.

I am most impressed by the dedication, commitment, and professional expertise that participants demonstrated, over and over again, during this series of miniconferences. They are the real experts in career education. I hope that, just as I have learned from them, so, too, will their thoughts and their experiences be helpful to you.

—Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

5

Funding for K—12 Career Education Efforts: Examples and Recommendations

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

Introduction

Funding for K-12 career education efforts was *the* Number 1 concern raised by K-12 participants in the OCE sponsored series of 1979 "miniconferences." The topic was raised by one or more participants, in each of the 15 miniconferences, and selected as a priority item for discussion, by participants in 7 of these. It was very clear that the experienced K-12 career education coordinators attending these miniconferences perceived themselves as much more adept at solving problems of how to *do* career education than problems of how to *pay* for it. This, of course, is not to say they have failed to find a multiplicity of answers to the funding problem because they have. It is some of those answers that will be reported here.

It should be made clear, at the outset, that the *patterns* of solutions found to the funding problem is a different topic than the *principles* involved in finding such solutions. At the time these "miniconferences" were held, not a single penny of career education funds available under P.L. 95-207—the "CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT"—had been released. Instead, when Federal funds were considered, these practitioners had been operating under the older pattern of Federal funds being available for demonstration, rather than for implementation, purposes. Thus, the *patterns* of funding during the next few years may well vary in many ways from those reported here. However, if the *principles* of funding recommended by these participants are followed, this monograph will have served its intended purpose.

The topic of "funding" logically divides itself into a number of major subtopics including: (a) what kinds of funding sources are being used? (b) how much funding is required; (c) what are funds for career education being spent for; (d) how do K-12 career education practitioners go about securing funds; and (e) what kinds of actions are required in order to assure career education funding on a sustaining, as opposed to a temporary, basis? Each of these subtopics will be considered here.

As answers given by these K-12 career education coordinators are considered, I hope their dedication to the career education concept will come through in a clear and forceful manner. They are persons who, despite all odds, have refused to give up on their attempts to convert that concept into effective action efforts. I also hope readers will become aware and appreciative of the creativeness and innovativeness of these K-12 career education coordinators. Those who read this monograph carefully will learn as

much about the kinds of professionals working in this area as they will about the kinds of solutions they have discovered. Both kinds of learning have serious and important implications for the future of career education.

An Overview Of The Variety of Funding Sources For K-12 Career Education Efforts

It would be extremely valuable had we been able to ask each of the 130+ participants in these "miniconferences" to fill out a detailed questionnaire telling us exactly how their career education efforts have been funded over the years. There were two major reasons why this could not be done. First, such an instrument, since it would be administered to more than 9 persons, would have had to been officially cleared by the Office of Management and Budget--and that would have been impossible to do in this project for a variety of reasons. Second, the structure used in organizing and conducting these "miniconferences" was one that called for participants themselves to identify problems for discussion and, for each such problem, to volunteer whatever information they wanted with respect to its solution. Under these arrangements, I had no right or opportunity to ask *any* single question to participants nor to expect them to provide any particular kind of information. As a result, those studying the answers presented here should do so knowing that they simply represent the pattern of responses as volunteered by participants in those "miniconferences" where the topic of funding came up for discussion—or by individual participants as they described their own career education efforts. In addition, readers should be aware of the fact that these participants had, typically, been engaged in career education for a number of years. Thus, some of the sources of funding they mentioned were ones used several years ago while others represent current activities. With these understandings, let us look at the funding sources reported by those participants who volunteered some information on this topic.

Prior to making a composite list of funding sources, it is important to emphasize, as did participants time and time again, that the single greatest source of funding for career education has been the "in kind" contributions of the business/labor/industry community. A good example of this was given by Dave Wasson, Career Education Coordinator in Kingman, Arizona who told us that, if only the "Career Education Fair" he organized as part of his total efforts were considered, he had calculated the "in kind" contributions of those persons from business/labor/industry who manned his 100 booths for 3 days to be $108,000. Such contributions did not, of course, count all the other "in kind" contributions of business/labor/industry persons represented when they served as career resource speakers in classrooms, when they hosted students on field trips, or when they devoted their energies to helping Dave publicize career education. Dave's total career education "budget," from State funds, amounts to only $116,000 annually. Thus, it is obvious that the "in kind" contributions from the business/labor/industry community are far greater than

the "hard dollars" one can see as directly budgeted for career education in Kingman. This same kind of pattern was obvious in community after community. Most had not tried to estimate these costs in any overall sense. One who had was Joyce McSpadden from the Charlotte-Meckenberg School District in Charlotte, North Carolina. Joyce, in attempting to get some "handle" on this, made a *very conservative* estimate that the time of each community resource person (including physicians, lawyers, etc.) was to be figured at $6.00 per hour. Under that assumption, she calculated the "in kind" contributions from business/labor/industry to amount to $78,000 annually—as opposed to the formal "budget" for career education which is $25,000 annually. Thus, *the "in kind" contributions from the business/labor/industry community were more than three times greater than the total amount of "hard dollars" budgeted for career education in that system.* Based on what I learned from all participants, I must agree with Joyce that this is a very conservative estimate indeed. Were this source of support to disappear, there is no way that career education could continue. This must be clearly understood from the beginning.

Given this understanding, it is additionally important to recognize and understand that, when funding sources for career education are identified, they are often multiple in nature. For example, Bob Megow, Career Education Coordinator for the Orange County Schools in Orlando, Florida told us that his career education budget for the 1978-79 period, comes from 11 different funding sources—including 7 Federal sources and 4 from the State or local level. In examining the list that appears on page 6, one should be aware of the fact that, in addition to using different funding sources in different years, several of these funding sources may be in use in a given school district in any one year. With these understandings, the following listing of career education funding sources may be useful to examine. Remember, each of these funding sources either has been or is currently being used to support one or more K-12 career education efforts.

Several observations are in order with reference to the composite summary found in the table above. First, it should not be surprising to observe that a variety of sources of Federal funding for career education are represented in this table. A recent Government Accounting Office study conducted during 1978 showed that same pattern. Covering the period beginning with FY 1974 and extending through FY 1978, that GAO report indicated that more than ten times as many Federal dollars for career education were expended from other OE elements than were funded as demonstration grants from OE's Office of Career Education. This is an excellent example of career education's "linking power" and one that other career education practitioners should keep in mind.

Table 1—Sources of Funding For K-12 Career Education Efforts Reported by Selected K-12 Career Education Coordinators

U.S. Office of Education Funds
- Office of Career Education demonstration grants
- Part C, Vocational Education Act Amendments (NOTE: No longer being used)
- Part D, Vocational Education Act Amendments (NOTE: No longer being used)
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III-A
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-A
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-B
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-C
- Higher Education Act (Teacher Centers)
- Education of the Handicapped Act (including Gifted and Talented)
- Consumer Education
- Women's Equity
- National Diffusion Network
- Emergency School Aid Act

National Institute for Education (NIE)

United States Department of Labor
- Youth Employment Training Program, CETA
- Youth Incentive Entitlement Program, CETA
- Summer Youth Employment Program, CETA
- YOUTH WORK

Appalachian Regional Commission

Direct funding from the Private Sector
- National Alliance of Business (Career Guidance Institutes primarily)
- Local Chambers of Commerce
- Individual Business and Corporations
- Economic Development Councils

Community Service Groups
- Rotary, International
- Kiwanis
- Junior League

State Level Funding
- State laws and/or State legislature line item appropriations
- State Education Agency Vocational Education funds
- State Education Agency grants and "minigrants"

Local School District Sources
- Donations from local teachers' union
- Line item for career education budgeted by the Board of Education
- Instructional Department Funds (primarily for materials)

Second, while (in order to avoid being misleading) no exact count appears in the table above with respect to how many local school districts were using each of the 33 sources of funding found in the table, it should be observed that the largest single number of participants reported using State and/or

local funds, not Federal funds for their career education efforts. This appears to be due, in part, to the fact that some have operated, from the beginning, with State and/or local funds only and, in part, to the fact many local school districts who began their career education operations using Federal demonstration funds are now relying on local funds to keep career education going on a sustaining basis.

Third, those studying this table should observe the fact that, while Federal funds for career education coming directly from Vocational Education are no longer being used to fund career education demonstration efforts, there are still several States where State vocational education funds are playing a major role in keeping career education alive and building it still stronger. Chief among such States appear to be Ohio and Oregon. Dr. Bryl Shoemaker, State Director of Vocational Education in Ohio and Mr. Monty Multanen, State Director of Vocational Education in Oregon, have both been conceptual leaders, as well as sources of sizeable financial support, for career education in their States. Other States as well—including West Virginia, Iowa, New Jersey, Connecticut and Illinois, are, according to "miniconference" participants, still investing heavily in career education activities using State vocational education funds. At the local school district level, the use of vocational education funds for career education is still more pronounced and obvious. Good examples are seen in Detroit Lakes, Minnesota where Cliff Clauson directs the effort, in Camden, South Carolina where Gil Woolard is in charge, in Toms River, New Jersey under the direction of Joe Tomaselli, and in Tacoma, Washington, where Jim Capelli serves as Director of Career and Vocational Education. The current absence of Federal vocational education funds for career education is more apparent than real in that a good deal of Federal vocational education funds are now being supplied for a variety of kinds of "career guidance" projects which, so far as I can tell, are translated into "career education" when put into practice at the local school level.

Fourth, some of the newer OE programs having especially great potential for use in career education include the new TEACHER CENTERS just now beginning to appear, the various projects being funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (where interest among practitioners at the local school district level appears to be very high), in the Women's Equity Program (where career education can be easily pictured as a vehicle for achieving some of the goals of that program), and in the National Diffusion Network (which now has a specific category called "career education" for use by those career education sites who have successfully passed through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) of OE and been declared to be "educational practices that work." While these sources of OE funding haven't been used as extensively in the past as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, each *has* been used in one or more of the local school districts represented in these "miniconferences" thus demonstrating the *potential* for use as being present. We must hope more local school districts take advantage of this potential in the future.

Fifth, there currently appears to be a major trend toward using funds available under several of the Youth Program titles of CETA for career education. The most popular sub-part being used, according to these participant reports, is the YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAM (YETP) although several also reported using the SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (SYEP)—which used to go under the acronym of SPEDY. Where such CETA funds are used, participants reported them to be largely restricted to providing special career education opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth although, in some communities, they are used even more broadly. For example, Chuck Farnsworth, from the Four County Area Vocational Cooperative in Garrett, Indiana, reported that YETP funds are being used to pay 100% of the costs of career education in that school district. While it is most unlikely that many other local school districts will be able to carry it this far, it is certainly appropriate for local school districts to look for ways in which they can link the funds they may now be receiving under the CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT with those available under the YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAM OF CETA. It should be noted that the CETA law itself calls for such linkages—in spite of the fact that not many local school districts have yet taken advantage of this requirement.

Sixth, at least 10 of the local school districts represented in these "miniconferences" reported using funds made available to them from the National Alliance of Business (NAB)—especially for doing faculty inservice work in career education through the NAB "Career Guidance Institute." There appears to be little doubt but that, in setting after setting, the NAB "career guidance institutes" have become, in reality, "career education institutes" and that more classroom teachers than couselors are being accepted as participants in such institutes. The State of Alabama is a good example of one State where a major portion of teacher inservice in career education is currently being conducted under the auspices of NAB "Career Guidance Institutes." Many more communities should be seeking to make this linkage.

Several local Chambers of Commerce are now contributing directly to the costs of career education at the local level through providing both physical facilities and some of the personnel costs. This trend can be seen in such diverse settings as Hartford, Connecticut, in Boulder, Colorado, and in Grand Rapids, Michigan. So, too, are local "Economic Development Councils" who see the clear need for and desirability of a close linkage between "career education" and "economic education" efforts. Such funds do not have to be large in order to make the career education and economic education efforts part of the same broader "package." This is well illustrated by the $3,000 grant Alton Harvey, in Mobile, Alabama received for his economic development component and by the close tie-in between career education and economic education seen in Thera Johnson's program in the Weber School District at Ogden, Utah.

Two other sources of funding mentioned by various participants seem to me to need special highlighting here. One is the example of having the local teachers' union supply some funds for use in teacher inservice in career education. In one community, it was reported that an actual cash donation had been made by the teachers' union while, in another community, it was reported that the teachers' union had made a strong recommendation to the Board of Education that some of the school district's "inservice days" be specifically earmarked for career education. There could be no stronger endorsement for career education than one such as this from the local teachers' union. The other example that needs to be highlighted here is that of using regular "instructional department funds" to purchase career education materials. Again, this is not a practice that was reported by very many participants, but it is certainly in the direction we would like to go in our attempts to have "career education" eventually become part of "good Education."

Quite obviously, those school districts who felt most secure about career education were those where the local Board of Education had designated "career education" as a hard line budget item. Such communities were limited to ones where the local Board of Education had adopted a strong policy statement endorsing the career education concept. While, of course, it would be nice to be able to say all of the 130 + school districts represented in these "miniconferences" had received this kind of commitment already from their Board of Education, it is not true—at least not yet. We can, and do, continue to hope that this is the next stage direction in which funding for career education will go. Apparently, fewer than 20 of these school districts had reached this point when these "miniconferences" were held. That is, had they done so, I believe more participants would have remarked about it. The *ultimate*, in local funding for career education, will come, it seems to me, at that point when the career education concept is so totally infused into the entire Education program—and the Education system working so closely with the broader community—that a term such as "career education," "work and Education," or any similar kind of term will no longer be needed. We are, of course, very far from reaching that point yet (with the exception of only a few local communities scattered across the Nation).

How Much Does A Career Education Effort Cost?

When questions are raised regarding the "costs" of career education, most persons seem to be looking for a "per pupil" type of answer. Few such answers will be found in this section for several reasons. First, participants did not, by and large, report their costs in this fashion (with the exceptions to be noted below). Second, the "costs" of career education depend on whether one is talking about "start up cost," "demonstration costs," or "sustaining operational costs.' The answer would be quite different depending on which of these three perspectives is being used. Examples of each will be given here,

but no attempt will be made to present any kind of "average" because we simply don't have the kind of good data base required for doing so. Third, and by far the most important variable for those who ask about the "cost" of career education, will be what activities are undertaken in the name of career education—and especially the extent to which specialists are employed as "coordinators" or "directors" of such activities. Insights into the "costs" of career education, from that perspective, will be found in the next major section of this monograph, not in this section. Here, some illustrative examples will be presented with respect to the range of costs incurred in local career education operations as reported by "miniconference" participants. It will be obvious that only a minority of participants volunteered any kind of specific data with respect to this question.

Let us begin by reporting figures given us by those participants who did voluntarily supply others in their "miniconference" with sufficient information so that *some* kind of estimate could be obtained regarding a "per pupil cost" for career education operational efforts. First, Polly Friend, from the Marquette-Alger Independent School District in Marquette, Michigan, told us that, using State appropriated career education funds, the Michigan State Department of Education has allocated funds to local school districts in the amount of $4.00 *per certificated employee*. While, of course, there is no really accurate way of knowing what this translates to in terms of per pupil costs, it seems safe to say that it would amount to something less than $1.00 per student. Polly acknowledged that this amount is not really sufficient to do all that is needed to be done in career education and must be supplemented somewhat with other funds.

A second example of what appears to be a relatively low per pupil cost for career education was reported by Sandra Bode, DuPage Elementary Career Education Center, in Wheaton, Illinois. Sandy reported that, using State vocational education funds, the Illinois State Department of Education has established 19 Centers such as hers throughout the State. Each operates as a consortium serving a number of local school districts (Sandy's, for example, serves 23 elementary school districts). To participate in this Center's activities, each local school district must, initially, contribute $1.00 per student for the first year's operation. Following the first year, the State Department of Education pays somewhere between 75¢ and $1.25 per student served by each of these regional centers. The basic idea here, of course, is that, by pooling resources, small rural schools can receive the expertise and a good centralized pool of career education materials in spite of the fact that not much money is available to any one of them.

This same general idea of encouraging small school districts to share their limited career education resources by joining in a career education consortium of some kind was illustrated by Kathy Backus, Area Cooperative Education Services Center, New Haven, Connecticut. In Connectiut, Kathy told us that each local school district is allocated $1.61 per pupil for use in career education. Small school districts, whose State allocations are under $1,000,

are encouraged to pool these funds by a consortium similar to the one in which Kathy works. There, as is true for Sandy Bode, the Career Education Center is well-staffed and well-equipped with career education materials which are available to each of the participating school districts. Don Grava, also from New Haven, reported to us that, in addition, each school district is charged $50 per school per year to join the Career Center.

A final example reported of very low cost per student operation of a career education effort was given us by Shirley Iaquinto, Career Education Coordinator in Phoenix, Arizona. Shirley reports a per pupil cost of approximately $2.00. This is far less than Phoenix was spending in their early days of operation and, as Shirley said, they can no longer do some of the things in career education that would be nice to do. At the same time, Shirley feels this amount to be sufficient to sustain a viable career education effort—especially when combined with the vast amount of "in kind" contributions she receives from the broader community.

Now to programs whose per student cost appears to be somewhat higher. First, Bob Megow, Career Education Coordinator in Orange County, Florida (Orlando) stated that his annual career education budget is $762,000—which obviously is a lot of money. This amount, however, is used to provide comprehensive career education for about 88,000 K-12 students and for an additional 30,000 postsecondary students as well. Thus, unlike Sandy Bode's or Shirley Iaquinto's program, Bob serves older persons as well as very young elementary school pupils. His per student cost, by my rough calculations, comes out to be roughly $6.50 per student per year.

An even higher per student cost, apparently, is seen in the career education effort coordinated by Dave Wasson in Kingman, Arizona. There, Dave reports receiving $116,000 per year State career education funds for use with about 11,000 students scattered throughout the very large geographic area he serves—a per student cost, I figured, of about $10.50 per student per year. Part of this higher cost is obviously due to the very large geographic area to be covered.

Of those participants supplying sufficient data so as to enable us to make a per student cost estimate, the highest was reported by John Meighan, Coordinator of the Career Development Program at the Tri-County Joint Vocational School in Nelsonville, Ohio. There, using a combination of career education funds supplied by the Ohio State Department of Education and by the Appalachian Regional Commission, John reports an annual operating cost of $356,000 required to serve about 15,000 students—an average of about $23.70 per student. In part, this higher per student cost is caused by travel problems associated with the rural area in which John operates. In part, it is probably due to the fact that there are many economically disadvantaged students in that area who require more help than would be true in some other parts of the country.

In summary, these seven examples where something approaching "per pupil costs for career education" data were available, we found four averaging somewhere between $1.00 and $2.00 per student while, for the remaining three, one cost about $6 per student, one about $10 per student, and one about $24 per student. In each instance, these costs were reported to be those required to make career education a sustaining effort—i.e., they do not represent the expectedly high "start up" costs required when a program first begins. Obviously, what is done in these seven school districts in the name of career education varies considerably from school district to school district. That discussion comes later in this monograph.

Other participants, while not providing the kinds of exact data that would allow one to calculate a "per pupil" cost for career education, did give us some more general figures regarding the size of the career education budget in their district now being used to *sustain* career education efforts on a continuing basis. In hope that such figures will provide some kind of helpful perspective to others they will be reported here. Briefly, these reports can be summarized as follows: (a) Betty Barr, in Omaha, Nebraska, estimates the sustaining costs for career education to be about $56,000 per year; (b) Don Jenny, from Carson City, Nevada, had budgeted $14,000 of local school funds for a career education effort there (but a tight school budget caused its elimination); (c) Bo Ryles, Coordinator of Career Education in Gretna, Louisiana (a large school district forming a major part of the suburbs of New Orleans) told us that it takes about $200,000 per year to maintain their career education effort which, in terms of initial start-up costs, had spent $400,000 in their first year of operation; (d) Joyce McSpadden, from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School District in Charlotte, North Carolina, operates her career education effort, on a sustaining basis, for about $25,000 per year; (e) in Concord, New Hampshire, Steve Jones reported that, following initial start-up costs of $80,000, they are able to sustain their career education effort for about $30,000 per year; and (f) Rose Muliere, from the Riverside Unified School District in Riverside, California, reported having $65,000 available for career education in that large school district which has to be used this year to try to meet more than $125,000 of requests for career education assistance from individual schools in that school district. One of the interesting things I noticed, time after time, was that, when participants discussed "start up" costs versus "sustaining" costs, the sustaining costs were rarely half as much as the "start up" costs. At least this appears to be true for school districts who started out as "demonstration" sites for career education using Federal funds.

Two especially dramatic examples of this can be seen in reports given by Chet Duggar from Peoria, Illinois and by Keith Currey from Riverton, Wyoming. Both had originally received very large Vocational Education Act Part D career education demonstration grants in the 1970-73 period. Peoria's was about $250,000 per year while Riverton, Wyoming received about $270,000 annually during the period of this demonstration grant. Both Chet and Keith reported the current costs for sustaining career education in their

school systems to be considerably less than those initial amounts. This was a common pattern in the early years of career education—i.e., the pattern, essentially, was to "saturate" demonstration sites with a very large amount of money for use in career education with a hope (and expectation) that such money will result in such a complete and successful effort that the local school district would continue once the Federal funds ran out.

Those familiar with provisions of P.L. 95-207—THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT—will be acutely aware of the fact that this piece of career education implementation legislation is not based on the kind of assumption of massive "start up" costs in order to initiate a career education effort. On the contrary, this legislation is built in such a way that, in most States, local school districts can expect to receive relatively small amounts of money for use in beginning career education. Two examples of how this idea works in practice—both from Missouri—were uncovered during this series of "miniconferences." First, Sarah Walkenshaw, Career Education Coordinator for the Kansas City, Missouri school system, reported that her efforts started with a single $5,000 "minigrant" from her State Department of Education (which she used in getting some junior high teachers committed to and enthusiastic about career education). Since that time, Sarah has increased her career education budget through applying for and receiving both a State Part D Vocational Educational Amendment grant and an ESEA grant. She has also received a $90,000 donation from the JUNIOR LEAGUE in Kansas City to help in implementing career education. The other pertinent example here was reported to us by Cecelia Morris from the Diamond R-4 School in Diamond, Missouri—a very small school district, Cecelia started with a $3,000 "minigrant" from the Missouri State Department of Education which carried with it a requirement that the local school district had to put up 15 percent of that amount as "matching funds." Using this very small amount of money, Cecelia has been able to make good progress in getting both teachers and community members interested and involved in career education. It is not a big effort yet, of course, but they have been able to do some amazingly successful things with this small amount of money. Both Sarah and Cecelia represent examples of what, with P.L. 95-207, may become a basically new and different way of getting started in career education.

What Are K-12 School Districts Doing With Their Career Education Funds?

To answer this question in a complete and accurate fashion would require a complete description of the career education efforts in each of the 130+ local school districts involved in this series of "miniconferences." Obviously, space limitations preclude this approach. As an alternative, I want to begin here with a few generalizations that I have gained from reading the complete set of

notes on which this series of monographs is based. Following this, we will provide some specific examples of ways individual school districts are making special use of the kinds of funds illustrated in the table appearing earlier in this monograph.

First, some broad generalizations appear to be in order. The primary ways in which these local school districts appear to be using their career education funds are for: (a) staff development of educators; (b) infusion efforts aimed at getting career education concepts into the regular curriculum; (c) establishment and operation of Career Education Resource Centers (including purchasing and/or developing "homemade" career education materials for use in such Centers); (d) developing and publishing Community Resource Guides (including making and maintaining the contacts required to validate the contents of such guides); (e) teaching "career education" courses; (f) developing short and long range plans for comprehensive career education efforts; and (g) employing part-time or full-time career education coordinators. (It would be nice if I could say that one of the *major* ways school districts appear to be spending their funds is on evaluation of career education but, unfortunately, I cannot say so based on these notes.) In general, then, one could conclude that, by and large, local school districts appear to be spending their funds on the kinds of activities eligible for funding under provisions of P.L. 95-207—THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT. To this extent, at least, things look very positive indeed.

In an attempt to see if the various *sources* of funding for career education listed in the Table appearing earlier were used in distinctly different kinds of career education activities, a sampling of career education practices, as contained in the "miniconference" notes, were undertaken. That "sampling" produced such results as:

The Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) funds of CETA, when used in career education, appeared largely to be used in making special career education experiences available for economically disadvantaged youth in addition to the total set of career education opportunities made available to all youth. This pattern can be seen in Altoona, Pennsylvania (as reported by Ardell Feeley), in Sycamore, Illinois (as reported by Pete Johnson), and in Clear Lake, Iowa (as reported by Vic Pinke). On the other hand, Kathy Backus, in New Haven, Connecticut, reported using YETP funds to establish both a computerized career information system and a vocational assessment simulation center which, while made available without charge to YETP youth, could also be made available under other arrangements to all other youth. Jim Williams, in New Albany, Indiana, was able to use SYEP funds from CETA to provide career education inservice education to 50 "lead" teachers during the Summer thus equipping each of them to return to their individual buildings as "career education crusaders" the following Fall and Linda Transou, in Denver, Colorado, was able to use YETP funds from CETA

to provide a comprehensive career education effort for economically disadvantaged 16-19-year-olds. Thus, CETA funds, while typically used to supplement career education efforts for all students by giving a special emphasis to the economically disadvantaged, are not always being used in this fashion.

Funds from ESEA, Title I, are being used by Jane Okamato, Windward District Office in Kaneohe, Hawaii, to train regular Title I ESEA coordinators and teachers in career education so they will be able to take over this career education leadership function once Jane leaves her position as a "career education specialist" and returns to her regular job assignment. In Newton, Kansas, Mary Kosier has used ESEA Title III funds in clarifying and strengthening the role of the school counselor in career education.

Title IV ESEA funds are apparently being used in still more diverse ways by local school districts. For example, Title IV-C ESEA funds are being used by: (a) Jane Okamoto (Kaneohe, Hawaii) to prepare and make available to teachers bibliographies of career education materials; (b) Pearl Solomon (Pearl River, New York) for making career education teacher "minigrants" and for use in validating the career education model Pearl has built; (c) Barbara Churchill (Attleboro, Massachusetts) for staff development in career education; (d) Gail Anderson in the South Berkshire Educational Collaborative #2 located at Great Barrington, Massachusetts for employing and paying the salary of a career education coordinator to serve schools in that region; (e) Janie Hire at Putnam City High School in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma for establishing and operating a truly magnificant career education resource center; and (f) Judy Johnson from the Mamaronuck Public Schools in Mamor, New York to pay for validation of their career education model for transporting that validated model to other school districts for their use. There is no single discernible pattern of use in a particular phase of career education's implementation that can be found when one studies all these examples. Title IV-C of ESEA has obviously been used for a great variety of career education efforts.

Pearl Solomon, from Pearl River, New York, also provided us with an example of: (a) a teacher's union who provided some funds for teacher inservice education in career education; and (b) use of regular departmental instructional funds for use in purchasing career education materials.

Funds provided local school districts by their State Departments of Education, either through State legislatively appropriated funds or State vocational education funds, have been used for a wide variety of kinds of career education activities. For example, Kathy Backus, in New Haven, Connecticut has used such funds to: (a) purchase career education materials; (b) provide teacher inservice in career education; and (c) conduct career education needs assessments. Sandra Bode, in Wheaton, Illinois, has used State vocational education funds to establish a Career Education Resource Center. Dale Davis, from Oregon City, Oregon, emphasized that he finds State career education funds needed primarily to do planning for career education and that, with only $5,400 of such funds, he has been able to do so. Shirley Arberg, from

River Grove, Illinois, has used State vocational funds to establish and operate a Career Guidance Center which makes major contributions to career education in that area. Carol Chapin from the Washoe County Schools in Reno, Nevada, has been able to use State career education funds for the general staff development work required in her career education effort. Finally, Mary Kosier, in Newton, Kansas, has been able to use some State appropriated funds to fuse economic education and career education into a single, unified effort.

As might be expected, the greatest variation in use of a special "kind" of career education funds was found when reports from those schools depending on local funds supplied by their Board of Education were studied. For example, Martha Johnson, in Pope, Mississippi, used local funds last year for 36,000 miles of career education field trips for students—at a cost of 27 cents per mile. (Martha told us she doesn't know what she will do in the coming year when the cost will climb to 72 cents per mile for student field trips!) Steve Jones, in Concord, New Hampshire, is using local career education funds to supply interested teachers with $200 "minigrants" and, for developing a Career Education Resource Center. (Note: Steve reported such things take higher priority where he is than using such funds to employ a full-time career education coordinator.) Jim Crook, in Yakima, Washington, has used local funds to establish and operate a CAREER CENTER which serves as the hub and primary vehicle for use by local schools in his area for implementing career education. Bard Snodgrass, in Palmer, Alaska, is now completely dependent on local funds—since his Federal career education funds have run out. He is getting and using local funds to make and refine a complete K-12 scope and sequence plan for career education, and for drawing a variety of kinds of community resources into his total career education effort. Jim Sullivan, in Cumberland, Rhode Island, has also lost Federal funding now but has found local funds for use in operating a CAREER CENTER that houses material useful to both students and to teachers interested in career education (Jim operates the CAREER CENTER in his "spare" time). Finally, Bob Wilson, from Gastonia, North Carolina, while using local funds at present to develop and involve community resources for career education, is eagerly looking forward to possible availability of P.L. 95-207 funds so that he can expand his career education efforts in a variety of innovative and creative ways.

While undoubtedly not apparent from the examples presented here, the single way in which career education funds—from whatever source—are currently being used by K-12 school systems that surprised me is the frequency with which they are used to establish and to operate some form of CAREER EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER. While this is not the place to discuss the nature and operation of such Centers, one of the monographs in this series has taken this topic as a major item of discussion. Hopefully, readers of this monograph will also study that publication.

How to Make Funding For Career Education A Sustaining Priority In Education

Cliff Clauson, from Detroit Lakes, Minnesota, emphasized that career education needs, perhaps more than anything else, to be regarded as a continuing, permanent priority of Education—just as vocational education is at the present time. Cliff's point was that, so long as "career education" continues to be regarded as something that might "go away" at the end of any particular school year, it is bound to operate on very shaky ground. It was obvious that many other "miniconference" participants agreed with this expression of need as the general topic was raised and discussed, as a priority issue, in several of the "miniconferences."

When participants talked about career education as a "sustaining effort" they sometimes talked about (a) how to *make* it into a sustaining effort; while, at other times, they talked about: (b) how to *keep* career education as a viable sustaining effort once a commitment has been made to do so. While perhaps not immediately obvious, it was clear to me, as I tried to assemble the thoughts and recommendations of participants for purposes of reporting them here, that these are two distinctly different topics. For purposes of this monograph on "funding," only the first of these two topics is appropriate to discuss here. The second will be discussed in another monograph in this series.

The generic, broad generalized answer participants gave to the question of "how can career education become a sustaining funding priority?" was that it should be declared as a priority of the Board of Education, the top administrators in the school district, and the building principals at each school in the district. To say this, of course, is not to really supply an answer but rather simply to state a condition which, once attained, would lead one to conclude that "career education" has become a funding priority for the school district. The real question to be asked—and hopefully answered—is "how can Boards of Education, top administrative officials in the school districts, and building principals be convinced that career education *should* be a sustaining and permanent priority of the school system?" It is participant answers to this question that will be given here. Such answers will be given in terms of a number of basic strategy suggestions made by participants. These strategies will be listed and discussed here with no pretense being made that each needs to be followed nor that they should be undertaken in any special order. All of these strategies are in use and/or have been used in one or more school districts represented in these "miniconferences."

Strategy 1: Picture "career education" as a coordinating vehicle for use in meeting new and emerging priorities. This general strategy was voiced in several "miniconferences" but was discussed as a priority issue in only one. The basic problem, obvious to any who work in the field of Education, is that new priorities constantly come on the scene, each raised by some external force, and each seeking to gain attention and support from local school

systems. Clint Rouse, from Daytona Beach, Florida, illustrated this by observing that, while career education was a very high priority in his school district 3-4 years ago, it has been replaced, to some degree at the present time, by other priorities such as "economic education," "consumer education" and the "back to basics" emphasis. Clint is devoting major efforts toward convincing policymakers in his school system that career education is a useful vehicle for use in meeting each of these priorities—that it *is* a proper tool for use by those who wish change in Education. Al Glassman, Career Education Coordinator in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Public Schools, illustrated the problem of new and emerging priorities also by noting that current "priorities" in Philadelphia include: (a) desegregation; (b) consumer education; (c) back to basics; (d) parenting; (e) sex education; (f) economic education; (g) vocational education; (h) nutrition education; and (i) bilingual education. Al felt strongly that "career education" should—and could—be used as a coordinating vehicle within the school system for meeting all of these priorities. He is making progress toward helping this become a reality by virtue of the recent establishment of the INTERNAL COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR CAREER EDUCATION within the Philadelphia Public Schools. As Chair of that Council, Al meets regularly with the Directors of every major Division in the school system to discuss possible ways in which career education may be used as a vehicle for meeting one or more of the current priorities of each Division.

Thera Johnson, Career Education Coordinator in the Weber School District, Ogden, Utah made a major contribution to discussion of this strategy by emphasizing the essentialness of differentiating, among new Education priorities, those for which career education can appropriately serve as a coordinating vehicle and those for which it cannot. Thera's point was that career education can properly play such a role if the "new priority": (a) is properly implemented through an "infusion" strategy through regular courses and with existing personnel; and (b) is properly implemented through greater school/community interaction. Using this reasoning, Thera argued that "career education" can properly be sold to educational decisionmakers as a coordinating vehicle for use with such new "priorities" as: (a) parenting; (b) basic skills; (c) economic education; and (d) vocational education but that it would be neither proper nor possible to use "career education" as a coordinating vehicle for such new priorities as (a) bilingual education or (b) nutrition education. Lois Parker, Career Education Coordinator in Montgomery County, Maryland, voiced this same general caution by warning that one of the dangers career education faces is that of "over promise and under delivery." While not in the same "miniconference" as Thera, I have a feeling that Thera and Lois would be in basic agreement on this point.

Strategy 2: Emphasize "career education" in terms of its expected LEARNER OUTCOMES, not in terms of its DEFINITIONAL CONCEPTS. Both Al Glassman and Thera Johnson made strong appeals for use of this strategy and other participants in their "miniconference," as well as in several others, seemed to agree with them. Lynn Griffiths, Coordinator of the

Tri-County Career Education Program in Belmont, New York, and Joe Tomaselli from Toms River, New Jersey were among those who also emphasized this strategy. Their basic argument was that, so long as we spend time trying to define "career education" to educators and to the general public in broad, conceptual terms, we will continue to have confusion regarding both its true meaning and, more importantly, what it can accomplish. Instead of using such broad definitions, they urged that we talk in terms of such "learner outcomes" as (a) increasing basic academic skills; (b) providing students with good work habits; (c) providing students with personally meaningful work values; (d) providing students with a basic understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system; (e) providing students with self-understanding and understanding of both educational and occupational opportunities available to them; (f) providing students with career decisionmaking skills; (g) providing students with job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills; (h) providing students with skills in making wise and productive use of leisure time; (i) providing students with skills useful in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they restrict freedom of career choice; and (j) providing students with skills necessary in humanizing the workplace for themselves.

Their basic point was that, by emphasizing these kinds of career education LEARNER OUTCOMES, everyone—educators and non-educators alike—will understand the need for career education and its basic delivery system far better than will be the case if we continue to simply talk about it in broad, conceptual terms summarized in a one sentence definition. This same basic point was raised by participants in several other "miniconferences" as part of the arguments they used for moving to eliminate the term "career education" altogether. They argued that, if we can "sell" policymakers in Education on efforts to equip students with such skills as represented by these LEARNER OUTCOMES, it is unimportant whether or not the "package" is called "career education."

In a slightly different way, Dale Davis, from Oregon City, Oregon was endorsing this same strategy when he recommended going to the Superintendent and to the Board of Education with *specific requests* for things needed in career education rather than with a *general request* for endorsement of the career education concept. Dale does this each year in a letter to his Superintendent in which he summarizes career education accomplishments during the current school year and then makes specific requests for further actions in the coming school year. He told us that, if his record of accomplishments in the preceding year includes specific data documenting what has been done, it is difficult for the Superintendent and the Board of Education to turn down requests for other specific action steps that he makes. In doing this, Dale doesn't talk about the kinds of "learner outcomes" recommended by Al and Thera but, rather, about such things as the need for "inservice education days," "field trips," "career education materials," etc.. While the list of topics looks different, then, the basic principle is the same.

Strategy 3: Convince key teachers that career education is a vehicle that will help, not hurt, them. This, too, was a basic strategy recommended by participants in several "miniconferences" from several different perspectives. For example, Gail Anderson, from the South Berkshire Educational Collaborative in Great Barrington, Massachusetts stressed the importance of convincing Department Heads, no matter how hard they are to reach, of the advantages career education holds for teachers. Winnie Hoersch, an elementary school teacher in Bismarck, North Dakota, on the other hand, pointed to the fact that, in almost every school, there are some "Queen Bees" (or "King Bees") who dominate discussions in the faculty lounge and that, if such persons advocate career education, other teachers are likely to follow their lead. A third approach was that taken by Sarah Walkenshaw in Kansas City, Missouri when she started with only four junior high school industrial arts teachers who were extremely interested in career education and used the enthusiasm of those four to influence others. Whether, then, one picks as "key" teachers (a) the ones with the most "power of position"—i.e., Department Heads; (b) "power of persuasion"—i.e., the "Queen Bees" in the faculty lounge; or (c) the ones with the most "power of enthusiasm"—i.e., those most "turned on" to the concept, there seemed to be general agreement that a general strategy of finding and using "key" teachers to convince other teachers of the worth and desirability of career education is a good one to use. This strategy is now in use in many school systems including efforts of Max Brunton, Parkrose School District in Portland, Oregon, and Bob Towne, a 4th grade "lead" teacher in Kennebunk, Maine. It seems, then, safe to say this strategy is really in use from coast to coast!

There were several basic reasons given by participants supporting use of this stategy. First, they reasoned that to secure a Board of Education policy supporting career education will have little effect unless classrom teachers decide *for themselves* that they *want* to implement that policy. While basic policymaking in Education is not the resposibility of teachers, it is true that teachers are the *operational determiners* of which policies are put into effective practice, which are given "lip service," and which ones are effectively ignored. Second, they reasoned that, to move toward making career education a community collaborative effort prior to the time there is some *internal commitment* and readiness for this to occur within the Education system is to invite failure. A President of a local industry and the Superintendent of Schools can agree very quickly that an industry/education collaborative effort should come about, but, until and unless both the industry's employees and the teachers in the school system decide *they* want it to happen, it won't really occur. The broader community appears to be more ready to work collaboratively with the Education system in career education than the Education system is to work with the broader community. This must be recognized and taken care of. Third, participants reasoned that the best person to "sell" teachers on the career education concept is another teacher—not a "career education expert"

or some other kind of "outsider." They felt strongly that the "it takes one to sell one" approach is the best one to use.

In order to "sell" a teacher on career education, participants felt strongly that they must first become convinced that career education is an effective vehicle for use in improving the quality of the teaching/learning process. Gaytine Blackford, a 5th Grade teacher in Diamond, Missouri, for example, reported she was "sold" when she saw that: (a) her pupils liked the "career ed" approach to teaching and (b) career education offered her a good way of showing pupils the importance of learning what she was trying to teach. Jerry Fincher, from Malvern, Arkansas, reported some of his previously "hard to reach" teachers became enthusiastic about career education when he showed them results obtained from classes where teachers were using that approach indicating that scores on standarized achievement tests had risen, in three years, from the 48th percentile to the 65th percentile on the average. Teachers want to be assured that career education: (a) will not detract from the subject matter they are teaching; (b) will help students learn more subject matter; and (c) will make the teaching/learning process more exciting and challenging for the teacher. Other teachers can show them such things.

The use of "lead" teachers was also reported to be important as a means of helping teachers avoid some of the fears they have regarding career education. For example, Janet Andre from the Rockland County BOCES in West Nyack, New York reported some of her teachers expressing a fear that, if students spend part of their time out in the community (rather than in classrooms) perhaps some teacher jobs will be abolished. Dale Davis from Oregon City, Oregon reported some of his teachers expressing that same fear. Such teachers can be reassured when they realize that career education calls for teachers, as well as students, to interact with the broader community.

Strategy 4: Use persons from the business/labor/industry/professional community to convince policymakers in Education to adopt career education as a sustaining priority. John Sedey, from the Mounds View School District in St. Paul, Minnesota emphasized that, if his Chamber of Commerce urges his Board of Education to include a career education emphasis in the Education system, they will be likely to do so. Homer Sweeney from the Fremont Unified School District in Fremont, California is convinced that whether or not career education will be a sustaining priority funding area for the school district will depend more on persons from the business/labor/industry community than it will depend on educators within the school districts. He gave an example of a National Alliance of Business (NAB) representative who, after attending a teacher workshop on career education for seven hours one day (he was supposed to stay only one hour but become so interested he stayed all day!) went later to the Superintendent of Schools and personally persuaded the Superintendent to make career education a priority for the school district.

Jim Williams, from New Albany, Indiana emphasized strongly that, especially in smaller communities, community leaders from business, labor,

and industry are strong forces in determining the policies and priorities of the Education system. Career education, with its emphasis on providing youth with general employability skills, is, in effect, asking schools to do what many employers have asked them to do for years. Employers can, in many cases, make a more eloquent plea for career education than can educators because they, the employers, know why they need it. Furthermore, prior to gaining a school board commitment to career education, it is highly unlikely that any person will be employed in the local community as a "career education specialist" so there is no one "inside voice" within the Education system to make the case. In such instances, participants felt voices from the local community—even if they come from outside the Education system—will be heard more clearly and more sympathetically by school board members than will voices of "career education experts" from the regional, State, or national level.

Finally, participants arguing for use of this strategy pointed out that, since career education is a fairly low cost budget item, it will be expected to have greater difficulty being declared a priority than things calling for a greater share of the total Education budget. That is, the natural tendency of a school board members and Superintendents is to place their highest priorities on those things that cost the most money. If arguments with respect to what should be school system priorities come only from those within that system, it can be expected that those having the largest budgets will receive the highest priorities. Thus, this is another reason why participants felt strongly that the voice of persons from the business/labor/industry/professional community must be heard.

Strategy 5: Use students and parents as "consumer advocates" for career education. Kathy Backus, from New Haven, Connecticut, is very much convinced that, if school systems engage in student "needs assessment" activities, career education will consistently show up as a high priority item among students. Jama Roman, Career Education Coordinator in Toledo, Ohio, supported this and pointed out that the "childs rights" movement may well become the major civil rights movement of the 1980's. In this connection, she feels strongly that if child advocacy community movements—such as the Junior League—are brought into the picture, it could be a very effective way of gaining school board funding commitments for career education on a sustaining basis. Jane Okamato, from the Windward District Office in Kaneohe, Hawaii, told us that students in that district have already written a "STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS" that includes strong statements saying they both want and need career education as a high priority in their school district. Phyllis Robinson, from the Wayne County Independent School District in Wayne, Michigan reported that the use of student "testimonials" regarding both their need for career education and the ways in which current career education activities have been helpful to them were very effective devices for her in gaining a sustaining commitment for career education in her school district.

Similarly, participants felt very strongly that parents can be—and are—very effective advocates for making career education a sustaining priority budget of local Boards of Education. Mary Remington, from Pittsburgh, Kansas, recommended that if even parents from just one school in the system will really become involved in pushing the career education "crusade," the effort will soon spread to parents of students in other schools and on to the Board of Education. Betty Neuwirth, Counselor at Hosterman Junior High School in Robbinsdale, Minnesota, reported that, when they did a parents' survey, they found that 85 percent of the parents gave career education their top priority rating with respect to things they would like to see in their school system. Carolyn Corcoran, from the South Portland City Schools in South Portland, Maine told us that, at one time, when a proposal was made for a cut in the career education budget for her school district, a group of parents came to the School Committee meeting and raised such a big stir over this that the School Committee wound up *adding* $25,000 to the career education budget for the following year!

In addition to arguing for the *effectiveness* of the "consumer advocate" approach to gaining sustaining financial commitments to career education, several participants also pointed out the *appropriateness* of such an approach. They did so by emphasizing the fact that the career education concept represents one of the basic *goals* of Education—i.e., preparing youth for work—rather than any one of the current *programs* which combine to make the Education system. In addition, the goal of career education is one that is seen as appropriate for ALL youth at ALL levels of the K-12 school system, not as something to be emphasized only from some students at some points in that system. Thus, to argue for career education, from a "consumer advocate" point of view, was seen as arguing for increasing the quality of the entire Education system—rather than pitting one part of that system against any other part.

Strategy 6: Use the influence and financial incentives available through State Departments of Education. Herb Tyler, from the Richland School District in Richland, South Carolina was one of many participants arguing for use of this strategy as a viable means of influencing local Boards of Education to recognize and to provide sustaining funds for career education. Participants from States where a State "mandate" for career education has been issued by a State legislature, but no State funds appropriated for use in implementing that mandate, seemed to feel that the "mandate" itself is of minimal value. Conversely, participants from States where the State legislature has appropriated some funds to be made available to local school districts in implementing career education—even when such funds are for small amounts—seemed to agree that this is an excellent strategy for use in calling career education to the attention of their local Board of Education.

Arguments of those supporting use of this strategy seemed to have three basic components. First, it was argued that, operationally, the chances of any career education level, at the local school district level, becoming a sustaining

effort will depend on having some person employed—either within the school district or in some intermediate unit serving that school district—with the title "CAREER EDUCATION COORDINATOR." If no person carrying an analogous title is employed by the State Department of Education, they felt it would be very difficult to convince local Boards of Education to support this kind of position. It should be pointed out that several other participants questioned strongly the need for a position entitled "CAREER EDUCATION COORDINATOR" at the local school district level and so opposed this argument. (The whole topic of the CAREER EDUCATION COORDINATOR will be discussed in another monograph in this series.)

Second, those arguing for at least token financial support from the State level pointed out that even small amounts of State money specifically earmarked for career education provides a needed element of "respectability" for those seeking financial commitments from their local Boards of Education. To have the United States Congress appropriate some Federal funds to support implementation of career education at the K-12 level was regarded by these participants as a most positive occurance indeed. They seemed to be more concerned that *some* such funds were available than they were about the fact that these funds currently amount to a very small amount of money per school district. Similarly, in States where the State legislature has appropriated funds specifically for use in career education (as, for example, in Arizona, Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, Utah, and Colorado) local career education coordinators from such States seemed to agree that the presence of some State funds served as a "positive sign" to those policymakers in Education at the local school district level who are asked to make some kinds of financial commitment to career education.

Third, participants supporting this strategy gave repeated examples of communities who, with demonstration funds from the Federal or State level, had been able to produce sufficient evidence of success for career education that it now continues to be supported by local funds. A total of 16 local school districts represented in these "miniconferences" were ones now using local funds after having had major Federal funds available for use in demonstrating career education's efficacy and effectiveness. Participants, in general, seemed very confident that, if given a proper chance, they could produce the kinds of evidence that would convince local Boards of Education to continue to fund career education efforts on a sustaining basis once Federal and/or State demonstration grants have expired.

Each of these three basic components represents an effective rationale for use by those wishing to utilize this strategy.

Concluding Remarks

In this monograph, we have tried to face the crucial problem of funding for career education in a direct and straightforward manner. No attempt has been made here to present any kind of idealistic or theoretical approach to

the problem. Rather, the emphasis throughout has been on sharing the experiences of local K-12 school districts throughout the Nation as each has faced—and, to at least some extent—solved the funding problem for itself. No single answer or "formula" emerged from the exchange of experiences that participants shared with each other. Instead, if there is a common theme, it is one of diversity.

As I listened to these participants—and especially as I have tried here to take my notes made during the series of "miniconferences" and draw from them specific examples of practice to be included in this monograph—I am left with a very optimistic impression regarding chances for being able to solve funding problems facing career education. The solutions these K-12 career education practitioners have found are ones which, by and large, have never before appeared in the career education literature. I cannot help but feel they will surely be valuable to others faced with similar problems.

The funding question for career education, like the funding question for other parts of Education, will surely be influenced markedly by the presence or absence of Federal funds for career education. My general impression is that the presence of Federal funds would undoubtedly greatly speed the implementation of career Conversely, what I have learned from these participants is that, if Federal funds are nonexistant, they will find some ways of continuing their efforts anyway. The richness of career education, as a national effort, is not in the money it has. Rather, it is in the people who have dedicated themselves to converting the career education concept into an operational reality.

Participants

Shirley Aberg
Assistant Director of Career Guidance Center
Region 7 - Triton College
2000 5th Avenue
River Grove, Illinois 60171

Inez Anderson
Fairfield Avenue
Haydenville, Massachusetts 01039

Janet Andre
Rockland County, BOCCS
61 Parrot Road
West Nyack, New York 10960

Kathy Backus, Director
Career Education Resource Center
Area Cooperative Education Services
800 Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Betty Barr
Career Education Director
11629 Jackson Road
Omaha, Nebraska 68154

Gaytina Blackford
118 W. 1st.
Joplin, Mo.

Sandra Bode, Director
DuPage Elementary Career Education Center
421 N. County Farm Road
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Max Brunton
Administrative Assistant
Secondary Instruction
Parkrose School District #3
10636 N.E. Prescott
Portland, Oregon 97220

James G. Capelli, Supervisor
Vocational & Career Education, K-12
Clover Park School District
10020 Gravely Lake Drive, S.E.
Tacoma, Washington, 98499

Carol Chapin
Curriculum Coordinator
Washoe County Schools
425 East Ninth Street
Reno, Nevada 89512

Barbara Churchill, Director
Project Potential
Attleboro High School
Rathburn Willard Drive
Attleboro, Massachusetts 02703

Cliff Clauson, Director
Vocational Education Administration
425 Broadway
Detroit Lakes Cooperative Center #22
Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56501

Carolyn Corcoran
South Portland City Schools
130 Wescott Road
South Portland, Maine 04106

James Crook, Director
Career Center – A.C. Davis High School
212 South Sixth Avenue
Yakima, Washington 98902

Keith Currey
Guidance Counselor
Freemont School District
322 Elizabeth Drive
Riverton, Wyoming 85201

Dale Davis
Director of Career Education
P.O. Box 591
1417 12th Street
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Chet Duggar
Director of Secondary Curriculum
3202 N. Wisconsin Avenue
Peoria, Illinois 61603

Ardell Feeley
Assistant Superintendent
Altoona Area School District
5th Avenue and 15th Street
Altoona, Pennsylvania 16602

Jerry E. Fincher, Counselor
Magnet Cove High School
Route 5, Box 473 AA
Malvern, Arkansas 72104

Charles Fransworth
Four County Area Vocational Cooperative
Garrett High School
Garrett, Indiana 46738

Polly Friend, CEPD Specialist
Marquette-Alger ISD
427 West College Avenue
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Albert I. Glassman
Executive Director for Career Education
J.F.Kennedy Center
734 Schuylkill Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146

Donald Grava
Supervisor, Career Education
185 Barnes Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06513

Lyn Griffiths, Coordinator
Tri-County Career Education Programs, S.W.
6 South Street
Belmont, New York 14813

Alton Harvey
Career Education Coordinator
Mobile County Board of Education
P.O. Box 1327
Mobile, Alabama 36601

Janie Hire
Career Education Specialist
Putnam City High School
5300 N.W. 50th
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73122

Winnie Hoersch
Elementary Instructor
Pioneer Elementary School
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Shirley Iaquinto, Coordinator
Roosevelt Comprehensive Career Education
600 South Seventh Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Donald Jenny, Administrator
Administration Office
1402 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Judith Johnson, Coordinator
Mararonuck Public Schools
740 Boston Post Road
Mamor, New York 10545

Martha Lynn Johnson
Career Education Coordinator
Pope High School
Pope, Mississippi 38658

Peter Johnson, Principal
Sycamore High School
Sparton Trail
Sycamore, Illinois 60178

Steve Jones
Office of Superintendent of Schools
16 Rumford Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Thera Johnson
Career Education Coordinator
Weber School District
1122 Washington Blvd.
Ogdon, Utah 84404

Mary Kosier
Central Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School
Newton, Kansas 67114

Robert Megow
410 Woods Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32802

John Meighan, Coordinator
Career Development Program
Tri-County J.V.S.
Rt. 1 – State Rt. 691
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

Joyce McSpadden
Academic Intern Program
Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education
Charlotte, North Carolina 28230

Cecelia Morris
Career Education Project Director
Diamond R-4 School
Diamond, Missouri 64840

Rose Muliere, Director
Pupil Services
Riverside Unified School District
3380 14th Street
Riverside, California 92501

Elizabeth Neuwrith
Counselor
Hosterman Junior High School
5550 Zealand Avenue N.
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 56501

Jane Okamato
Windward District Resource Teacher
c/o Department of Education
Windward Disrict Office
45-955 Kamahameha Highway
Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744

Lois Parker
Coordinator of Career Education
Montgomery County Board of Education
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Vic Pinke
Career Education Consultant
Northern Trails Area Education Agency
P.O. Box M
Clear Lake, Iowa 50428

Mary Remington
USD #250
510 Deill Street
Pittsburgh, Kansas 66762

Phyllis Robinson
Career Education Consultant
Wayne County ISD
33500 Van Born Road
Wayne, Michigan 48148

Jama Roman, Coordinator
Career Development Program
Toledo City Schools
Manhattan and Elms Street
Toledo, Ohio 43608

Clinton M. Rouse
Coordinator of Career Education
P.O. Box 1910
Volusia County Schools
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015

Bo Ryle
Career Education Coordinator
Jefferson Parish
519 Huey P. Long Avenue
Gretna, Louisiana 70053

John Sedey
Director of Vocational Education
Mounds View District #621
2959 Hamline Avenue N.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55113

Brad Snodgrass
Coordinator of Career Education
Mat-Su Borough School District
P.O. Box AB
Palmer, Alaska 99645

Pearl Solomon
District Curiculum Coordinator
Pearl River School District
Pearl River, New York 10965

James Sullivan
Coordinator of Career and Distributive Education
Cumberland High School
2600 Mendon Road
Cumberland, Rhode Island 02864

Homer Sweeney
Career Education
Fremont Unified School District
40775 Fremont Blvd.
Fremont, CA 94538

Joseph Tomaselli
Director of Placement & Career Education
Ocean County Vocational-Technical School
Old Freehold & BeyLea Rds.
Toms River, New Jersey 08753

Robert Towne
Elementary Supervisor
Kennebunk School Department
Kennebunk, Maine 04043

Linda Transou
Career Specialist
Denver Public School
2650 Eliot Street
Denver, Colorado 80211

Herb Tyler
Richland #2
6831 Brookfield Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29206

Sarah Walkenshaw
Coordinator of Career Education
4904 Independence Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri 61424

David Wasson, Coordinator
Mohave County Career Education Project
515 West Beale Street
Kingman, Arizona 86401

Jim Williams
Career Education Coordinator
1825 West Beehler Street
New Albany, Indiana 47150

Robert A. Wilson
Career Education Coordinator
Gaston County Schools
943 Oscoala Street
P.O. Box 1397
Gastonia, North Carolina 28052

Gil Woolard
Director
Kershaw Vocational Center
Route 4, Box 143
Camden, South Carolina 29020

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1980 O—302-004